



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: ST. PETERSBURG: PARIS: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *June, 1906.*

I WRITE in the lull of the Whitsuntide recess, and just before the reassembling of Parliament. This is perhaps as good a time as any in which to review the achievements of the Government. They have been varied and valuable. No Government within my recollection has ever done so much in so short a time, and I am wholly out of my reckoning if its record of performance is to be ascribed merely to the energy of the new broom. The present House of Commons emphatically means business. It has buckled down to work with a very real determination to obtain results; and that determination, so far from being a passing impulse, will, I believe, endure, may even gather, as time goes on, a fresh momentum, and will undoubtedly leave a deep and abiding mark upon the social, industrial and political structure of this country before it is exhausted. The House showed its mettle at the start by working through the formal debate on the Address in record time. It went on to endorse certain far-reaching principles that in a few years will probably be embodied in legislation—the feeding at public expense of necessitous school-children, the payment of Members of Parliament, Old-age Pensions, and a sweeping reform of land tenure. It appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the canals and inland navigation of the kingdom. It has passed through its second reading a Bill to compel foreign vessels engaged in the British trade to conform to the rules adopted for the safety of the British merchant navy. It has also passed through its second reading a Bill making further provision in regard to workmen's compensation for injury. This Bill extends the right to compensation to all workmen other than police constables, clerks, domestic servants, and members of an employer's family dwelling in his house. Certain industrial

diseases, such as anthrax, are henceforward to be classed as accidents, and the Home Secretary has power to enlarge the schedule. Compensation may be claimed after a week's disablement, instead of a fortnight's, and elaborate provisions are made for assessing damages in the case of non-continuous employment, and for settling differences as to the nature of disablement by means of medical referees.

With the Trades Disputes Bill I have already dealt at length in these letters, and here I need only remind the American reader that it practically guarantees to the funds of Trades Unions a total immunity from actions at law. Besides this, the Government has radically altered and improved the Rules of Procedure. The House now meets at a quarter to three instead of two o'clock, and sits continuously until eleven, the interval for dinner from seven-thirty to nine having been abolished. It is not unlikely that further changes will soon be forthcoming. Thus, the Select Committee on Procedure has just reported in favor of referring practically all non-financial measures, after their second reading, to one of four Standing Committees. On these Standing Committees thirty members are to constitute a quorum, and the distribution of Bills among them is to rest with the Speaker. I do not know whether the Government intends to adopt these recommendations. They clearly make for the quicker despatch of public business, but they will not less certainly produce at Westminster the same results that have flowed from almost identical devices at Paris and at Washington, and convert government by Parliament into government by Parliamentary Committees. But it is quite open to the Government to reform the procedure of the House of Commons, and increase its efficiency, without attempting anything heroic. If it were enacted that Bills might be carried on from session to session of the same Parliament at the stage they have reached, and if the Speaker were empowered to declare the result of a division without compelling the House to waste twenty minutes by walking needlessly through the lobbies, two long steps would have been taken towards making Parliament a businesslike assembly. At present under normal circumstances Members spend five per cent. of their time tramping through the lobbies to record their votes; and, when a contentious measure, such as the Education Bill, is before them, the percentage of wasted time is doubled. Mr. Lewis Harcourt, the First Commissioner of

Public Works, has indeed proposed a scheme by which the average time of each division will be reduced from twenty to some six minutes.

But to go on with the list of Ministerial achievements. The President of the Board of Trade some three weeks ago introduced a useful Bill to provide for taking a census of the output and production of British manufactures. It will interest Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Garfield and the Supreme Court to know that the census is to be compulsory, but that, as in the case of the income tax, full security is given against the divulgence of private information. The House has yet to determine whether the census shall be taken every two or every five years. A day or two after its introduction, the Plural Voting Bill was read a second time. This is a measure for doing away with a minor anomaly, and not, I think, a very serious one, in the British electoral system. Hitherto, men have been allowed to vote in every constituency in which they hold property, and as the voting at a General Election in Great Britain spreads over a period of several weeks and is not compressed, as in America, into a single day, it has been possible for a loyal and energetic "pluralist" to vote for a dozen different candidates in a dozen different constituencies. For the future, if the Bill passes, as in the House of Commons it undoubtedly will, he will be called upon to select the constituency in which he intends to vote and to confine his party enthusiasm within its boundaries. It is also worth noting that the House of Commons towards the middle of May unanimously passed a Bill, introduced by one of the Labor members, prohibiting the importation of alien labor under contract to take the place of British workmen during a strike. There is nothing very remarkable in a House of Commons, dominated as this is by Labor influences, passing such a measure; but it met with an unexpected and significant fate. The House of Lords contemptuously, and to the intense indignation of the Labor members, threw it out. If the Bill had been a Government measure, the conflict between the two Houses, which is one of the certainties of British politics, might have been precipitated at once. As it was, the Lower House with many angry mutterings bided its time. Its time will come.

If not over the Trades Disputes Bill, then over the Education Bill, and possibly over both, a fierce struggle between the

Government majority in the House of Commons and the anti-Government majority in the House of Lords is inevitable. When it breaks out, it may be in a form and with a virulence that will swallow up all minor issues and turn the attention of the country exclusively upon grave questions of constitutional forms. The difficulty with the House of Lords is that, while a Conservative Government is in power, it sinks into the position of a mere annex to the Carlton Club, and that, directly a Liberal Ministry comes into office, it begins to assert at once and to the full its constitutional power of revision, amendment and rejection.

There has, perhaps, never been an English House of Commons less inclined than the present one to sit down under the domination of the House of Lords, or more thoroughly bent upon making its will supreme. If it finds itself seriously thwarted by the Upper Chamber, there will be many to recall that, in the last speech he ever delivered in the House of Commons, Mr. Gladstone pointed to the House of Lords as the final fortress of privilege which Liberalism would one day be bound to storm.

In addition to all this, the Government has brought in and passed through the initial stages about twenty other Bills of minor significance. But its greatest measure is, of course, the Education Bill, which will occupy the time of the House for some weeks yet, and may lead, as I have hinted, to something more than a passing quarrel between the two Chambers. Mr. Birrell is not finding it any easier than did his predecessors to reconcile the principle of popular support and control of the schools with the needs of the theologians. The Church of England bitterly, the Catholics and Jews with warmth and sincerity, denounce the compromise he has proposed and embodied in his Bill; and the signs of a lasting solution have not yet shown themselves.

Meanwhile, it is interesting to note that the House a few days ago rejected, by 477 to 63, one amendment that would have frankly secularized the schools, and by 367 to 172 another amendment that, while relieving the State of all direct concern with religious teaching, would have provided equal facilities for all sects to enter the schools at stated times and teach their distinctive doctrines. My impression is that the feeling in favor of a complete secularization of national education is greater outside the

House of Commons than inside it. "It is a painful fact," writes a shrewd observer of politics, "that, during all the debates in the House of Commons, and in all the multitudinous discussions of the Education Bill in the press, as in every one of the innumerable tracts and pamphlets being printed and circulated, there is hardly a single word about the education of the children. Their present schooling, and the fitting of them for their future struggles in the keen competition of life, furnish simply the battle-ground for disputing creeds. Beyond question, each day a larger number of persons deeply interested in the educational welfare of the coming generation are growing more and more impatient of all these unworthy religious quarrels, and approaching the view that the only method of dealing with them is for the State to wash its hands of them altogether." The English people have a good deal of sectarianism in their composition, but more common sense; and, if they become convinced that a final settlement of the religious question is made impossible by the rivalries and animosities of the theologians, they will be tempted to settle it themselves along purely secular lines. It may come to that in the end—whether sooner or later will be largely determined by the action of the Established Church and the House of Lords in regard to Mr. Birrell's Bill.

Another matter that the House has had before it and is now free from is the discussion of the Budget. Mr. Asquith's first essay in the art of national account-keeping is that of a cautious rather than of a great financier. With a surplus of three millions sterling to dispose of, he repealed the export tax on coal, remitted a penny of the tea duty, devoted half a million to the reduction of the debt, and set aside two sums of a little over a hundred thousand pounds apiece for the relief of schools in necessitous areas and for the purpose of effecting some small changes in postal rates. Nothing could well be flatter or more uninspiring. The Bill, however, passed the Committee without amendment, and for another year, at any rate, the income-tax payer will have to get along without relief. There were two passages in Mr. Asquith's speech that deserved and received attention. In the first of them, he showed that while during the past ten years population has increased only ten per cent., expenditure has gone up thirty-nine per cent. and the national debt twenty-one per cent. In the second, he laid stress on the steadily diminishing yield of

all the duties on alcoholic drinks. In 1900 just over 17,000,000 gallons of wine were consumed, and in 1906 only 11,800,000. The consumption of foreign and colonial spirits, mainly rum and brandy, has fallen from 9,350,000 gallons in 1900 to 6,780,000 gallons in 1906. In home-made spirits, chiefly whiskey and gin, there has been a drop from 38,700,000 gallons in 1900 to 32,500,000 gallons in 1906, while in the same period the consumption of beer has fallen off by precisely three million gallons. Altogether, the English people are drinking to-day about seventeen million gallons less than they were drinking six years ago. In spite of increased duties, the exchequer receives nearly two and a half million sterling a year less than it received in 1900 from alcoholic drinks. That is a plain cause of lamentation to the Chancellor. Whether it is an equal cause of rejoicing to the social reformer is another question.

I have already in previous letters touched on the somewhat unhappy tale of the Government's dealings with South Africa, and on the vote of censure upon Lord Milner that it indirectly helped to pass. Its foreign policy shows no such weaknesses. On the contrary, Sir Edward Grey's handling of the Algeciras Conference and of the trouble with Turkey over the Egyptian frontier was as far-sighted, as flexible and as firm as Lord Lansdowne's could possibly have been. The nation implicitly trusts Sir Edward Grey, and even his party opponents separate him from the rest of the Government in an isolation of confidence and good-will. Sir Edward is believed to appreciate more clearly than some of his colleagues the value of the Anglo-French *entente* as one of the buttresses of European peace. It is the pivot of his European policy, and may be utilized by him not only as a means of clearing off such outstanding questions as still remain unsettled between England and France—in Siam, for instance, in Abyssinia, and in the New Hebrides—but also as a stepping-stone towards an Anglo-Russian understanding. The common sense of England does not quite comprehend a friendship with France that leaves the ally of France out in the cold; and it may be taken for granted that every advance that Sir Edward finds it practicable to make towards an all-round settlement of Anglo-Russian difficulties will be warmly approved by the nation. That does not, however, imply any hostility, latent or otherwise, towards Germany. The Liberal Government, on the contrary, will

probably do all it can to remove the impression that war between England and Germany is "inevitable," or that the antagonism which undoubtedly separates them has any root in reason. Sir Edward Grey is the last man to think of abandoning France for the sake of conciliating Germany, but that will not prevent him from being the first to attempt to formulate Anglo-German relations on a basis of common sense, if not of cordiality. With all other countries, with the United States and Japan in particular, the national policy is to maintain and strengthen the present bonds of friendship and alliance, and to that policy the Liberals subscribe without a single reservation.

If the Colonial policy of the Government stood as high as its foreign and domestic policies, all opposition except on the Education Bill would have practically died out. Even as it is, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman has won for himself and his colleagues in a remarkably short time an assured position of mastery and trust.

ST. PETERSBURG, *June, 1906.*

ONE of the most eventful months of the Russian revolutionary period has just come to an end. It was the month which, so to say, restored to their true shape many things and persons that for a time had seemed bewitched, and it invested with reality several schemes which Liberal politicians deemed chimerical. The Duma, for instance, which not long ago was thought to be a chimera, is now a working institution; the Tsar, who was written about as though he were a Socialist and a Republican, has made a solemn profession of his faith in monarchic principles and of his respect for property and life; the revolutionists have given another superfluous proof that they are unable to cooperate with any established government. None of these occurrences, however, will have surprised the readers of the REVIEW, whom my last letter prepared for Count Witte's resignation; for M. Goremykin's accession to power; for the conservative, not to say reactionary, tendency of the new Cabinet; for the outward good behavior of the Democratic party in the Duma and the difficulty it would encounter in cooperating with the extreme Left. All these changes were predicted in my forecast, and their accomplishment has imparted to the situation the configuration which it will probably keep until the revolution has entered upon a new phase.

Since the Duma has assembled and shown the stuff of which it is made, the feeling in Court circles has become more intense against democratic government. For, as I ventured to surmise, the deputies have made short work of the paper barriers. The fundamental laws forbade them to touch this question or tackle that problem, but they brushed all these prohibitions aside and made straight for the goal. They decreed that a free pardon should be granted to all political prisoners, no matter how heinous their crime, and that capital punishment should be abolished once and forever. The land should be taken from those that have it and given to those who lack and desire it. The Second Chamber should be abolished and all power delivered over to the Duma, without whose approval no Cabinet should subsist. In a word, there should be no gradation in the process of reform and no bounds to its thoroughness. The most democratic countries in the world should be outdone by the reformed Autocracy. What was black yesterday should be white to-morrow. To those who object that the bulk of the Russian nation is characterized by crass ignorance, by grovelling superstition, by rude manners, by most of the qualities proper to enslaved peoples, the answer of the Democrats is, "If they cannot govern themselves, they can authorize others to govern in their stead, and we shall certainly discharge the task much better than the bureaucrats who have well-nigh ruined the nation." This may be true or it may be exaggerated, but it is the plea of a fraction, not the decree of the nation.

The Tsar's case is this. He granted certain concessions to his people and loyally means to abide by them. But the politicians who have come to speak in the name of the nation are not contented with these. They want not merely more power, but all power. They do not even ask for it, but act as though they might take as much as they wanted without anybody's leave. They demanded a Constitutional Assembly. It was refused. And now they themselves usurp the functions of a Constitutional Assembly by throwing existing governmental institutions into the melting-pot and moulding new ones. Now, this is a breach of compact. Either, then, the Duma will abide by the terms of the contract, or else the contract will be annulled. It seems most probable that the Duma will not be satisfied with the modest rôle assigned to it by the Emperor. For it already attempts to wield full legisla-

tive powers and claims other rights besides. It began by distributing their functions to each section of the new political machine; itself took the lion's share; the Council of the Empire got nothing at all, while the Tsar was degraded to the rank of a figurehead, a waiter at the banquet he gave to his subjects.

"Reign, but rule not!" were the stage instructions given to the Tsar. He was not permitted to exercise even such prerogatives as are jealously preserved by the most constitutional of rulers. He was commanded to pardon criminals, including murderers who had taken human lives *en masse* without ruth, with calm deliberation. He heard it publicly proclaimed that those men were not criminals but heroes, that their release was an act not of mercy, but of justice, that it was not requested, but demanded, and that it must be done at once. His Ministers, who according to the terms of the compact were to be responsible to him alone, were condemned by the Duma to lose their seats, his former Ministers were excluded by the Labor party from the benefit of the amnesty, and an amendment was laid before the Duma to have them impeached for obeying the Tsar's orders at a time when the Tsar's authority was unrestricted. Agrarian reform was demanded on lines which, in the opinion of many liberal-minded politicians, would shake the foundations of private property, open the door to state Socialism, and bring about national bankruptcy within a twelvemonth.

To the Court party all this smacks of Jack Cadeism, not of parliamentary government. In a Swiss canton, they urge, doubtful experiments of that kind might perhaps be made without entailing serious harm; but among a people of 140 millions they would be fraught with danger which might ultimately culminate in foreign intervention, to say nothing of the sanguinary deeds which would fill up the interval between the proclamation of party government and the inauguration of a democratic republic. "I am willing," the Tsar says, "to entertain any measure that may be laid before me in the name of the people's weal. But I will persistently refuse to consider any social reforms which tend obviously to ruin the community. And that is the tendency of the agrarian scheme, the amnesty and the proposed abolition of capital punishment. Therefore I withhold my sanction." That is the Emperor's position, and if the Duma deputies keep theirs, as they seem determined to do, a conflict is inevitable.

Neither the Court party nor the Tsar can prevail upon themselves to see heroes in the men who murdered their unarmed fellows, and to do away with the death penalty altogether. They maintain that murderers, incendiaries, robbers, are vulgar criminals and should be punished as such. They admit that there may occasionally be a political criminal deserving of forgiveness, just as there may be a dying man whose sufferings are so atrocious that it would be a mercy to put him out of pain. But they argue that in either case it would be a fatal mistake to generalize from a few exceptional cases and construct a universal principle upon them. Set free, the Russian murderers and "fire-bugs," many of whom are scoundrels, who merely tinge the color of their crime with politics, and you have introduced the thin edge of the wedge of lawlessness. Life will no longer be safe; law will be set at naught; order will give place to anarchy, well-being to misery, and it may well be that in their own interests foreign states may interfere.

The partisans of the Monarchy draw attention to the kind of criminals who are now being held up as heroes. They are often ruffians, whose real object is plunder, but who sail under the flag of revolution to save their skins. The same trick used to be practised in Paris during the last years of the Empire. I remember how a thief, having stolen a purse, a watch and a diamond pin near the Tuileries, was followed by a policeman in a crowd, when he suddenly shouted "*Vive la République!*" was arrested on a political charge and released two days later. Here in Russia on May 23rd nine brigands were arrested by the Libau police. Revolvers, cartridges and a book accounting for the distribution of the booty were found in their possession. The book, which was kept by the chief of the band, is most interesting. It is said to have proved that the members of this gang committed most of the murders and robberies which terrorized the population for several weeks. They called themselves Socialists, but in all probability even the most revolutionary of Socialists would disown them. Plunder was their aim and object, and the account-book shows how it was divided when secured. But they sometimes "worked" for almost nothing, like the hungry highwayman who, having struggled long with a well-dressed traveller and at last overpowered him, found in his victim's pocket only a bottle with instructions to take five drops after meals, "to remove the

feeling of fulness." Thus the Libau "Socialists" killed one man and found that he had only two dollars and a half in his purse.

To kill representatives of the Government may perhaps be defended or palliated on the ground that it is natural, but to slaughter fellow citizens is surely a crime. And that is what these terrorists are doing every day. If a man gives evidence in a court of justice, refuses to join the revolutionary circle, disagrees with one of the leaders or declines to pay large sums of money for anti-governmental purposes, he is generally condemned to death. And there is no appeal. Hence nobody dares to budge without the permission of the terrorists. Occasionally, indeed, some daring individual insists on exercising his personal liberty, but not for long. A typical case was that of a man named Welz-kabnin, whose father says: "My son was dragged out of the house one evening by unknown persons. He never appeared since then. A couple of days ago, his body was found in the river Dvina."

Another illustration is offered by the case of the schoolmaster Sanke. He was present at a teachers' congress, where certain revolutionary resolutions were passed which he was unable to accept. That is all. He was told that "those who are not with us are against us," but he answered that he hoped they would respect his personal freedom. Soon afterwards, as he was in his room, two revolver shots were fired at him through the window, but by an extraordinary chance they merely grazed him. Some weeks later, however, the "executioners" tried again, and this time with success. His life was snuffed out in a twinkling. To-day his widow and his little children are adrift in the world, not knowing to whom to turn for help. It was also in the Baltic provinces that a man named Herzan was shot by an individual who fired through the window. Before dying he gave the name of his murderer. Near the same place a man entered the house of a peasant, named Yurash, and asked "Are you Yurash?" "Yes." "Then take that and that." And as he spoke he fired a bullet into the peasant's chest and another into his abdomen. In the same district a coachman, named Wonaga, was taken into the woods and shot dead. Not far from the scene of these murders, the wife of M. Mendian, a schoolmaster, was shot dead. On May 20th two men wearing false beards entered the house of the

peasant Rupshe, and, meeting the head of the house, they blew his brains out without any more ado. His wife threw herself at the feet of the murderers, but they shot her dead and wounded her six-year-old girl. The child, however, was only wounded, not killed. Then these political reformers set fire to the house and escaped to the forest. An hour later, there was a mound of ashes where there had been a house and a family. The crime of the victims was that the peasant had obeyed a legal summons calling him to give evidence in a law court.

Members of the Court party ask whether it is wise or human to encourage men of that kind to commit acts like those.

Passenger trains are being fired at or derailed in various parts of the Empire. In Warsaw, a few days ago, in broad daylight, a bomb was thrown at Police Officer Constantinoff by a Jewish terrorist. The victim's body was blown to shreds, and some fifteen people, among them two ladies, were wounded. In Sebastopol, bombs were cast at the commander of the fortress, wounding over one hundred bystanders and killing eight, but leaving the destined victim unhurt. A telegram was thereupon sent to the President of the Duma by representatives of various sections of the population, protesting against giving an amnesty to criminals who thus squandered human life. But the Duma voted the amnesty unanimously, and on May 31st published a resolution decreeing the abolition of capital punishment.

The Tsar and his advisers agree with the senders of that telegram. They claim to be in favor of mercy, while opposed to the encouragement of assassination. In like manner, they are able to help the peasants by selling the land cheaply and on easy conditions, while they refuse to rob Peter in order to pay Paul. Crown lands, arable and wood lands, amounting in all to about 6,500,000 acres, and 3,500,000 acres offered for sale by private estate owners, are to be distributed among the neediest peasants on easy terms. This and whatever else may seem possible shall be done. But the line must be drawn at expropriation.

Those measures, however, will not solve the problem, nor even bring about an understanding between the Duma and the Government. In truth, the parliament and the Tsar's advisers are on opposite sides of a wide chasm, spanned by no bridge. Count Witte himself could not reconcile them now. The truth is that cooperation between the two is impossible. Hence at present there

is a deadlock in government, the Tsar being kept from legislating by his own self-denying ordinance, while the Duma has been compared to a mere debating club.

It is not clear what issue will be found out of this no-thoroughfare. Many politicians are inclined to look for a Liberal Cabinet as a practical settlement of the difficulty. I cannot share that view. If I may venture on a forecast, I should conjecture that the Tsar will wait until vacation-time has come, say, June 23rd or 30th, dismiss the deputies to their homes for the long summer holidays, and then leave them there. During the recess, his Ministers will make ready for a new parliament to be chosen in accordance either with a restrictive electoral law or with that of August last year. That is one alternative. Another is that the Upper Chamber, known as the Council of the Empire, will be transformed into a Duma.

In this the Tsar's councillors may be wise or foolish. I am not concerned to attack or defend them. What they urge in their own defence is certainly a strange plea, but at least it is intelligible. The Duma as at present composed is not, they hold, representative of the country. If it were, it would contain several parties, whereas it has only one, and is for that reason unanimous on all cardinal questions. It is an Opposition and nothing more, being devoid of reactionaries, of conservatives, of moderate Liberals. Are there none, then, in all Russia? Who are the people who are daily pouring in hundreds of telegrams from the provinces beseeching the Emperor to preserve all his rights intact, to grant no amnesty, and to rule as well as reign? Surely they are Russians. Those documents are signed by peasants, by priests, by noblemen. How is it that the priests and the peasants and the noblemen in the Duma are one and all democratic? It is because the mass of the Russians are listless, ignorant, inert, while the peoples of foreign extraction are alert, well informed, active. Hence the latter won the elections, while the former are devoid of a single spokesman. It is preposterous, the conservatives add, to think that a hundred and forty millions of Russians should be represented by democrats only, who are bent upon making the Tsar a mere figurehead. And if it is preposterous, it is a national grievance and should be redressed. Even the Council of the Empire is more representative than the Duma, because it contains men of every party.

That being the view adopted by the Tsar and his influential friends, it is but natural to anticipate the dissolution of the Duma during the long recess, and the creation of another assembly more faithfully reflecting the conflicting views of the nation. Meanwhile, terror continues to reign in vast districts of the Empire. Men are being condemned to death by secret tribunals and being killed by wandering bands. Trains are being fired at, derailed, held up. Travellers are robbed on the Tsar's highway, the imperial post is frequently seized, railway stations and government alcohol-shops are openly attacked and their takings carried off. Governors of provinces, military officers, prefects of police, soldiers, members of industrial firms, are being blown to pieces. Churches are being blown open by means of dynamite and plundered, prisoners are being rescued from gaol, banks attacked, country mansions, factories and mills are being burned to ashes. Fire-insurance companies are raising the premium on insurances, the price of land is falling, thousands of Russians are fugitives from their country, members of the Liberal party are transferring their money to foreign banks and the stock-market registers a serious fall in prices. Such are some of the signs of the times. Whither is Russia drifting? The Duma may be quietly dissolved whilst its members are enjoying their holidays, but this measure will only postpone the great sanguinary struggle which is now inevitable.

PARIS, *June, 1906.*

THE few strangers who had not deserted Paris on May 1st will never forget the very unusual aspect of the city on that long-dreaded day. The streets seemed to have undergone some mysterious enlarging operation, they were so still and empty. No cabs, no promenaders. The tram-cars ran as usual, but there were no passengers in them, and it seemed as if they were all bound for some unknown destination in quest of the runaway Parisians. Most of the shops were closed. The windows of private houses were shut, and one wondered what might be going on inside: were the inmates at a meal of Argentine mutton or wistfully inspecting a shoal of unconscious fish in the bath-room? Very few police were visible, but every now and then you would see a horse poking his head out of a coach entrance, and on his back a dragoon, and behind this sentry a dozen more horses and

soldiers squeezed into the narrow court and ready for emergencies that were not to come. For, if there were 120,000 workmen on strike in Paris, there were also 60,000 soldiers on duty, and who would dream of starting a revolution when no four people are allowed to linger in conversation on the sidewalk?

The universal terror on May 1st was the result of many combined anxieties. Nobody viewed the general election coming the Sunday after with entire confidence. The upper classes, manufacturers, and even small tradespeople, were afraid of the Socialists and of possible renewed attempts to bring on a revolution; the Socialists were afraid of M. Clémenceau, and hinted that he would carry into the polls the violent methods by which he crushes riots before they are born; the Radicals, and generally the old Republican party, were afraid of the popular movement created by the church inventories, which Royalists in disguise were only too ready to turn to account. At a dinner two days before the election, the Premier, M. Sarrien, praising the political stability of England to a fair neighbor, added with a sigh that no one in France could prophesy the results of the election.

Yet a feeling of relief has been noticeable after the eventful date of May 1st had been tided over, and, to a clear-sighted people, this return of confidence could not but appear as a happy symptom. The results of the election, which were made public on the morning of May 7th, showed that the electorate had recovered from its transient flutter and would not have any reaction whatever.

Never, since the establishment of the Republic, has a government been so completely, undeniably and overwhelmingly successful as the Clémenceau cabinet. The Socialists were gainers, it is true,—rising to seventy-two; but the Socialists were republicans, after all, and the Opposition was utterly and irretrievably defeated. The older Conservatives, known as “reactionaries,” were reduced to seventy-nine, and the Nationalists, who have been so busy during the last eight years undermining every government in succession, were deprived of all their chiefs without a single exception, and the whole group dwindled down to thirty. So, out of 590 deputies, hardly 110 were antirepublicans. No coalition of these with the Extreme Left was henceforward to bring about the fall of a cabinet, as had been seen quite lately in the case of M. Rouvier. Even the group of moderates, known as Progressists

and headed by M. Ribot, was not to be taken into consideration any longer. It numbers only sixty-six, and even should these, every now and then, vote with the Right, their interference cannot be felt. Practically, the Radicals have all the game in their hands.

So, at least for four years, the destinies of France are entirely trusted to the men who kept M. Combes in office such a long time, and the old *Bloc* is more formidable than ever. One cannot help rejoicing at a state of affairs which precludes every possibility of internal disturbance. The stupid blindness of the old parties to the conditions of new times does not deserve any sympathy; and, when they put forward the pretext of religious liberty to promote their dead theories, the language they use betrays them as hopelessly belated. It is the misfortune of the very few real Catholics of France—are there two millions altogether?—to have been championed by men who were monarchists or theocrats first and Catholics afterwards. Cardinal Gibbons wrote the other day to the Archbishop of Paris contrasting the freedom which Catholics enjoy in America with the persecutions they undergo in this country. A great deal of the difference arises from the fact that the Catholics of the United States are marked off from the rest of their countrymen merely by attending a particular church on Sunday, whereas French Catholics have only just begun to untrammel themselves from numbing political ties. As long as the English Catholics were constrained to further a Spanish policy, they were persecuted, and the habit of persecuting them survived its causes for many years. At present they shock nobody by opposing—on a legal ground—a Bill they deem inconsistent with their rights as citizens. Consequently, one must welcome whatever tends to create political unity in France. When it is established, old wrongs will get gradually and imperceptibly redressed.

Are we to expect the palmy days of unity and freedom in the near future? I am afraid not. I have repeatedly pointed out the tension which prevails in all political spheres and carries away even minds of a naturally moderate stamp. Nothing invites us to anticipate a relaxation. Only the ground of battle will be changed. The contest had been so far between the men, or the sons of the men, who have established the Republic, and those who still hold that France cannot thrive without a monarch. This battle has been fought, and a dictatorial power will not be

reinstated in Paris without some catastrophe,—a war or another Commune; and, if ever it is thus unexpectedly and unnaturally brought into existence, it will be for a short time. The march of progress will now be in the direction of social reforms, and the conflicting elements will be a gradually developing ideal of justice, and the antagonistic selfishness of those who possess and will not give, and those who do not possess and will not wait.

Practically, the only champions of social reform are the Socialists. A not inconsiderable fraction of Catholics, represented in Parliament by the Abbé Lemire, and grouped in a growing association known as "*Le Sillon*" ("The Furrow"), also have an almost exclusively social programme. But these young men are as yet more a hope than a force, and it may take twenty years more to dissociate them from the dead mass of Monarchist Catholicism. The Socialists consequently have the field of social improvement all to themselves.

They are in this country the lineal descendants of the well-known Utopists of the beginning of the nineteenth century, St. Simon, Enfantin, Leroux, etc.; and, when they reappeared about 1888, it was with the Marxist theories summed up under the general designation of "collectivism." The State was to appropriate all means of productivity and work them so as to reduce the obligation of daily labor to eight, six, three hours, or even less. The prophet of the doctrine was M. Guesde, the son-in-law of Karl Marx, and he has just been returned for Roubaix on the same lines.

The evidently fantastic character of this programme for a long time discredited M. Guesde, and the Chamber elected in 1893 counted little more than half a dozen Socialists.

During that parliament, M. Jaurès, a professor of philosophy, who had been elected as a moderate Republican, suddenly went over to the little group of Socialists, and gave them a new programme which was destined to improve their situation to an incredible degree. M. Jaurès gave up all hopes of the scheme of Marxist reconstruction, for which he substituted a programme of industrial reforms, such as laws of public hygiene, insurance against accidents, creation of an old-age pension fund, etc. At the same time, he was laying the foundations of a vast organization of Labor through trades-unions, syndicates and Labor Exchanges. The advisability and the matter-of-fact character of those reforms

speedily gained them supporters, and the presence of one of their champions, M. Millerand, in the Waldeck-Rousseau cabinet helped to carry some of them into execution, and gave them a look of reality which they had never worn before. In 1902, the Socialist group numbered fifty-two and had become, even in Parliament, a power without whose concurrence no government could last.

This political influence was nothing compared to the moral influence which M. Jaurès and his friends exercised. Nobody could be blind to the fact that they alone possessed a clear and complete programme, of manifest justice in some of its features, and preeminently popular. The Nationalist group also embodied a great and noble ideal, the patriotic idea, but they had strong Monarchist and militarist tendencies, and soon lost ground. On the Republican side, which in the present Chamber means five-sixths of the representation, the Socialists alone can propose something else than the purely negative anticlerical programme of the old *Bloc*.

The consequence has been that a great many Radicals have had to borrow from their trenchant neighbors, and no less than a hundred and twenty-eight have been elected on the Radical-Socialist ticket, thanks to declarations strongly tinged with Socialism.

Of course, many of these semi-Socialists have little faith in the policy they pretend to advocate, and will bring it but faint-hearted support, but it will be with them as with so many shilly-shally anticlericals, whom fear of their wives would have caused to vote for the Church, if the watchful eye of their Committees and parliamentary chiefs had not compelled them to vote against her. It is a law which has never been found at fault, in the last thirty years, that the minority in the Extreme Left leads the majority. Besides, it should be known that, in spite of resolutions passed by the Socialists at the congress of Châlons, M. Jaurès has supported Radicals even against his own followers when the latter had no chance in the final contest, and this politic self-denial must have its reward in the form of votes.

The Socialists, therefore, will be strong in numbers and pre-dominant in influence. The question now arises how likely they are to effect their designs, from an income tax to the nationalization of railways and mines, and eventually the appropriation by the Treasury of legacies outside the direct line of inheritance.

Judging by the tone of the papers, especially of the "*Humanité*,"—the very well-written organ of Jaurès,—they are determined to give a strong pull without much delay. The Radicals, they say, are sickening with their anticlericalism. If they do not rally round Jaurès, when he comes forward with the first reforms on his and also *their* programme, they will be nothing but pretenders who make fools of their electors. These first reforms are the buying back by the State of two railways—the Western and the Orléans—the least profitable of all. This would be a first step towards the nationalization of all railways and mines. The Socialists do not intend to take, but to buy back, these large businesses. This means an immense sum of money. Where is the Chamber to find it when the Minister of Finance, M. Poincaré, owns to a deficit of 250,000,000 francs (\$50,000,000), and when the Old-Age Pension Fund is an already yawning abyss? The Socialists know very well that the income tax they propose will not yield the necessary resources. But they are prepared with a method for raising considerable sums without any trouble, viz., the reduction of naval and military expenditure. Now, the nationalization of the larger industries does not essentially belong to the Socialist programme, but the curtailing of the Army and Navy budget does, and the inevitable gap between the Radicals and Socialists will appear when they come to this crucial experiment. The budget of the present year devotes 200,000,000 francs (\$40,000,000) to fresh military items, and, in the "*Humanité*" of May 31st, M. Jaurès says plainly that this sum shall not be granted if the Socialists make up their minds to resort to parliamentary obstruction.

Even now, the respective attitudes of the Socialists and Radicals are anything but friendly. Clearly there will be on one side M. Pelletan, who already talks of a reconstruction of the Cabinet and a return of M. Combes to office, and, on the other, M. Jaurès. Meanwhile M. Clémenceau has power in his hands and lays down schemes for governing without the Socialists. But he is as much hated by the old friends of M. Combes as by M. Jaurès, and, in spite of his rare and well-known abilities, and of the flexibility he very unexpectedly gave proof of in his first tenure of office, his situation appears exceedingly unstable.

The probabilities seem to be that the Radicals will try to gain time by carrying on the anticlerical campaign, which pleases the

Socialists and keeps dangerous questions in abeyance. But this feint cannot last long, and, when it proves no longer available, the Socialists must inevitably take the lead.

WASHINGTON, June, 1906.

THE interest with which the progress of the bill empowering the Interstate Commerce Commission to make rates for railways had been watched from the outset of the present session of the Fifty-ninth Congress, has been entirely eclipsed during the last few weeks by the dismay and apprehension caused on both sides of the Atlantic by the President's peremptory demand for the immediate extirpation of nauseous and dangerous abuses declared by him to exist in the packing-houses of Chicago. There seems to be no doubt that Mr. Roosevelt's attention was first directed to the subject by a book called "The Jungle," the author of which, Mr. Upton Sinclair, professed to have seen with his own eyes the odious and alarming conditions therein depicted. Naturally unwilling to rely on *ex parte* and sensational testimony, not officially verified, the President deputed two agents, whom he had reason to regard as trustworthy, Commissioner Charles P. Neill and Mr. James B. Reynolds, to make an independent and careful investigation of the Chicago packing-plants, and to report what they discovered. With their startling revelations before him, the President, reluctant to cripple, perhaps irremediably, an important branch of American industry, informed representatives of the packers that the damaging report would be withheld from publication, provided no resistance should be offered to the summary passage through Congress of a bill calculated to ensure a prompt and drastic reform of the existing conditions. Had the packers been fully alive to their own interests, they would have grasped the offer with avidity, and would not have confirmed the truth of the adage, "*Quem vult Deus perdere, prius dementat.*" At first, indeed, they did exhibit some foresight and common sense. They permitted a remedial bill introduced by Senator Beveridge to pass the Senate in five days, without amendment or delay. To their misfortune, however, they regained self-possession, and assumed a defiant attitude, when the bill reached the House of Representatives, of which a son of Illinois was Speaker, while Mr. Wadsworth, of New York, himself a cattle-raiser, was Chair-

man of the committee to which the measure was referred. The vehement and angry opposition which the bill encountered in the House committee provoked inevitably the very consequences which enlightened self-interest, nay, even ordinary caution, would have striven to avert. It constrained the President to publish the Neill-Reynolds report, in order to make known the grounds on which he had demanded legislative purgation of the packing-houses, and to fortify that arraignment with additional official evidence. The effect of the two messages, with which the cumulative proofs of abuses were transmitted, was electrifying, not only in the United States, but also in those foreign countries which, hitherto, have been large consumers of American canned products. In a day, not only our interstate traffic, but also the export trade in those commodities, was paralyzed. At home and abroad all attempts at denial, explanation or palliation on the part of the Chicago packers proved futile in the teeth of the President's proclaimed conviction. Outside of a committee-room of the House of Representatives, the incriminated parties could hardly get a hearing. Without listening to the pleas put forward by the defenders of the accused persons, without heeding even the admission of the Neill-Reynolds report that the slaughter-houses were wholly or mainly free from the abuses detected in the packing establishments, American and European customers, almost with one accord, refused to buy, not only the canned products, but even the fresh meats emanating from Chicago. It seemed for a moment as if the national meat industry in all its forms had received a death-blow.

Of course, the desire for animal food is too deep-rooted and too nearly universal for such an attitude of abstinence to be long maintained. For fresh meat, at all events, provided, of course, reasonable assurance of sanitary treatment be forthcoming, the demand will soon revive. Even by canned goods the American market will be to a large extent regained, as soon as the native consumers, henceforth vigilant and suspicious, are enabled to discriminate between the methods followed by this and that packing establishment. It is to be feared, on the other hand, that many a year will elapse before the exportation of those products to European countries shall recover its former proportions, for there the native competitors of American packers will not suffer their fellow countrymen to forget the recent revolting disclosures. Once more

the export trade in our canned products must be built up laboriously and warily, almost from the ground. Nor will American consumers fail to profit by the rigor with which sanitary regulations and precautions will henceforth be enforced in every department of the packing industry. There is no doubt that, even heretofore, canned goods intended for a foreign market have been prepared with relative care, in view of the searching inspection to which they were certain to be subjected abroad. All that Mr. Roosevelt originally asked for was that food sold to our fellow citizens should be as sound and wholesome as that intended for transmission to European countries. It is now notorious that hitherto such was not, and could not have been, the case, because the former commodities were exempt from the inspection applied to the latter by our Department of Agriculture. Unfortunately for the retention of the foreign markets, Europeans cannot easily be made to believe that the meat-packers of Chicago would systematically discriminate in their favor against the citizens of the United States.

All's well that ends well. Although, at first, Chairman Wadsworth and some other members of the House committee betrayed, by the sharpness, not to say harshness, of their cross-examination of Messrs. Neill and Reynolds, a disposition to favor the packers at the expense of the consumers, and went so far as to intimate that, in their opinion, the scandal ought to have been "hushed up," and that it did not behoove Americans to "foul their own nest," they yielded ultimately to the fierce and constantly increasing stress of public opinion, and reported a bill which, although objectionable in some particulars to the President and the minority of the committee, is calculated, on the whole, to bring about the reforms contemplated in the Beveridge measure. On the face of it, the substitute provides for inspection as rigorous as that sanctioned by the Senate. For example, the first section makes optional in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture an *ante-mortem* scrutiny of animals destined for interstate commerce, or intended for slaughter in any one of the United States. A like *ante-mortem* scrutiny is made *compulsory* in the case of live-stock meant for export. Moreover, in the case of all carcasses and parts of carcasses, whether intended for export or for interstate commerce, a *post-mortem* inspection must be made immediately after slaughter, under rules and regulations promulgated by the Sec-

retary of Agriculture. Compulsory *post-mortem* inspection is also prescribed for all carcasses and parts of carcasses which have been killed outright, and which are conveyed to packing establishments to be used in the preparation of food products. Nor do the precautions taken for the purpose of ensuring the purity of canned goods end here. It is further provided that the Government label, affixed to a given can, shall not be issued until after the inspector has convinced himself that the contents of that particular can are pure, wholesome, and fit for human food. In a word, the meats used in food products are to be supervised all the way from the hoof to the can. Neither, hereafter, must the labels be misleading in description. The names must clearly indicate the contents, except in the case of certain trade designations, which may be used only with the permission of the Secretary of Agriculture. That is to say, the label is to serve virtually as the passport of the product in interstate commerce, for, without the label, the canned commodity may not be transported from one State to another. This prohibition is enforced by the imposition of heavy penalties, including both fine and imprisonment, on packers who offer for interstate transportation, and also on carriers who receive for that purpose, any meats or meat-food products not bearing the Government inspection label, containing the words "inspected and passed." Neither shall clearance be given to any vessel bearing meats to a foreign country unless the ship can show a certificate that the meats have been duly inspected and passed—in addition to the labels borne by the meat and canned goods. We observe, finally, that the substitute proposed for the Beveridge bill makes provision for the immediate and total destruction, so far as food purposes are concerned, of condemned meats. We repeat that Government inspectors, working day and night, must follow a carcass from the hoof to the can.

The two features of the substitute, reported by the majority of the House committee for the Beveridge bill, which are expected to meet with disapproval in the minority report, and at the hands of President Roosevelt, are, first, the imposition of the cost of inspection on the Federal Government, instead of on the packers (as the President desired); and, secondly, the exemption of the inspectors and stock-examiners, to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, from the civil-service rules. The force of the former objection is lessened materially by the fact that the sub-

stitute allots three million dollars annually for the expenses of inspection, thus rendering it impossible for Congress, at a time when public interest in the matter might have abated, to cut down the appropriation, without the President's cooperation. If this provision is amended at all in the House, or in conference, it will probably be by the adoption of a suggestion made to the House committee by Judge Cowan, representing the Texas Cattle-Growers' Association, that if at any time the fixed appropriation of three million dollars should prove inadequate, the Secretary of Agriculture should be authorized to pay for extra service by levying a small fee upon the packers. Strenuous opposition seems likely to be made also to the provision exempting inspectors appointed under the substitute from the civil-service regulations. It appears that many members of the House do not repose absolute confidence in the Secretary of Agriculture, and there is some doubt as to whether Mr. Wilson will long continue to occupy that post.

It was to be expected that those who are doomed to suffer more or less seriously by the President's exposure of deplorable facts would dispute the expediency of washing our dirty linen in public. The conclusive reply to the complaint is that, if we had not washed it in public, it would never have got washed at all. In the long run, it will turn out that here, as in everything else, honesty is the best policy. When, hereafter, European consumers of canned products compare the frankness of our disclosures, and the trenchant character of the remedies forthwith applied, with the indifference to purity evinced in some competitive countries—Argentina and Australia, for instance—where there is no government inspection at all, we may feel assured that American canned products will then command the preference in the foreign markets which they will undoubtedly deserve. Meanwhile, undoubtedly, our packers will have to bear much loss, much odium and much tribulation; but, thanks to the thoroughness of the reforms demanded by President Roosevelt, and sure to be compelled by Congress, they will triumph in the end.